

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: STATIC RANDOM ACCESS (SRAM)  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

No. M 07-1819 CW  
(MDL No. 1819)

\_\_\_\_\_  
This Order Relates to All Cases  
Listed on Attachment A

ADMINISTRATIVE  
ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ("the Panel") has transferred to this Court for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings certain actions relating to an alleged conspiracy to fix the price of Static Random Access Memory, which is often referred to as "SRAM" (MDL 1819). The cases listed on Attachment A were filed in the Northern District of California and related to C-06-6491 CW, Dataplex, Inc. v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al., the underlying case in MDL 1819. These actions involve questions of fact that are common to the actions transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Northern District of California. The Clerk in the Northern District of California has established M-07-1819 CW, In Re Static Random Access Memory (SRAM) Antitrust Litigation, as the Master Docket for all SRAM litigation cases. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that all cases listed on Attachment A

1 shall be included in Master Docket M-07-1819 CW, In re Static  
2 Random Access Memory (SRAM) Antitrust Litigation, for coordinated  
3 or consolidated pretrial proceedings. **All pleadings relating to**  
4 **two or more actions shall be filed in the Master Docket. If a**  
5 **pleading relates to a single action, the pleading shall be filed in**  
6 **the individual action.** For subsequent cases filed in the Northern  
7 District of California, an Administrative Motion to Consider  
8 Whether Cases Should Be Related shall be filed in C-06-6491 CW,  
9 Dataplex, Inc. v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al. Upon the Court  
10 relating the subsequent cases, they shall automatically be included  
11 on the Master Docket.

4/25/07

Dated \_\_\_\_\_



\_\_\_\_\_  
CLAUDIA WILKEN  
United States District Judge

## ATTACHMENT A

4-06-6541 Madsen, et al. v. Samsung Electronics, et al.,  
4-06-6542 Maites, et al. v. Samsung Electronics, et al.,  
4-06-6652 Westell Technologies v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.  
4-06-6663 Takeda v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.  
4-06-6668 Juskiewicz v. Samsung Electronics, et al.  
4-06-6698 Chip-Tech, Ltd. v. Cypress Semiconductor, et al.  
4-06-6770 Ayers, et al. v. Samsung Electronics, et al.  
4-06-7006 Thompson, et al. v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.  
4-06-7007 Stargate Films, Inc. v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.  
4-06-7194 Katz v. Samsung Electronics, et al.  
4-06-7428 Markey v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.  
4-06-7637 Telular Corp. v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.  
4-06-7731 Reedy v. Cypress Semiconductor, et al.  
4-06-7851 Autotime Corp. v. Samsung Electronics, et al.  
4-06-7950 Greenwell, et al. v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.  
4-07-0228 Ralik v. Cypress Semiconductor, et al.  
4-07-0509 Baranic v. Samsung Electronics, et al.  
4-07-0916 Barnes v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.  
4-07-0918 Perez v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.  
4-07-0949 Koch v. Samsung Electronics, et al.  
4-07-0950 Hochstein v. Samsung Electronics, et al.  
4-07-0969 Kreitzer, et al. v. Cypress Semiconductor, et al.  
4-07-0993 Salzman, et al. v. Cypress Semiconductor, et al.  
4-07-1037 Berezin v. Alliance Semiconductor, et al.